

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,265	PENNER, AVI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carl H. Layno	3766	

All Participants:

(1) Carl H. Layno.

(2) William English.

Status of Application: After Final Amendment

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 May 2007

Time: 9:30PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102(b) *Schroeppel et al* (US 5,749,909).

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 4, 12, and 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Schroeppel et al (US 5,749,909) and *Chirife* (US 5,168,869)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

CARL LAYNO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Carl H. Layno
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner's amendments to claims 4 and 13 were discussed. The Examiner notified the attorney that claims 4 and 13 in their present form are deficient in that they do not contain limitations originally present in applicant's first amendment of claim 1. After some discussion of the Chirife (US 5,168,869) and the original 102 rejection of Schroeppel et al (US 5,749,909), it was agreed that claim 4 would be modified to include the missing language: "wherein the stimulation energy is generated in response to the electrical current", and that claim 13 would be modified to include the language "wherein the stimulation energy is directly transformed from the electrical current". This language, it was agreed, would overcome the references of the prior art..